



2017-18 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report

Cohort 11 and 12 Grantees

Submitted by:

Bryan C. Hutchins, Ph.D.
Wendy McColskey, Ph.D.
Melissa Williams, M.A.
Kathleen Mooney, M.A.

SERVE Center at UNCG
Dixon Building
5900 Summit Avenue
Browns Summit, NC 27214
(800) 755-3277

Submitted to:

Michael Wells, Ph.D.
Director, Federal Program
Monitoring and Support
NCDPI

March 2019

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled	3
Objective 1.1: The Majority (Over 50%) of Grantees Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students	4
Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools.....	5
Objective 1.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are in Need of Academic Support.....	5
Goal 2: Enrolled Students Meet Definition of “Regular” Attendance	6
Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More is At Least 70% (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School).....	6
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More Will Not Fall Below 87%	7
Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment	8
Objective 3.1: More than 85% of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area.....	8
Objective 3.2: More than 85% of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	8
Goal 4: “Regular” Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes	9
A. State Achievement Test Results	10
Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8), With Two Years of State Test Data, Who Improve from “Non-Proficient” (Levels I, II or III) To “Proficient” (Levels IV or V) Will Be At Least 11%.....	10
Objective 4.2: “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8) With Two Years of State Test Data Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change On State Tests in Reading and Math at Least as Great or Greater Than the State Population Year-to-Year Change	11
B. Classroom Teacher Survey on “Regular” Attendees’ Improvement at End of Year.....	13
Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding to a Teacher Survey Will Rate 21 st CCLC “Regular” Attendees’ Classroom Performance and Behavior as Improved	13
Summary	14

2017-18 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report: Cohort 11 And 12 Grantees

Introduction

Since 2002, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) has operated a federally-funded competitive grant award program to fund 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) to provide after-school services. The intent of this federal funding is for grantees to provide after-school (and before-school, weekend, or summer) academic enrichment opportunities for children attending high-poverty and low-performing schools as a means to help them meet local and state academic standards.

Each group of awarded grants (grantees) is called a cohort. NCDPI funded the first cohort of 16 grantees in 2002. Cohorts 2-8 (2003-09) averaged 20 grantees per cohort. In July 2010, the State Board approved funds for the largest cohort to date (89 Cohort 9 grantees, for a total award of \$24,982,787). In July 2013, the State Board approved funds for 52 Cohort 10 grantees totaling \$17,925,136. The following year, funds were approved for 68¹ Cohort 11 grantees totaling \$22,323,666. In 2017, 45 Cohort 12 grantees received funding totaling \$14,917,238². This report summarizes data from the two cohorts of grantees operating programs in 2017-18 (i.e., Cohort 11, with 61 grantees in their fourth and final year of funding, and Cohort 12, with 45 grantees in their first year of funding).

The purpose of this report is to provide descriptive information to inform NCDPI's monitoring of the performance of the grantees and participating students, statewide. The report is organized by NCDPI's goals and objectives for the 21st CCLC program, which incorporate required federal 21st CCLC objectives and performance measures³. The NCDPI goals and objectives for the program are:

- **Goal 1:** Projected numbers of students are enrolled.
 - **Objective 1.1:** The majority (over 50%) of grantees enroll at least 75% of their projected number of students.
 - **Objective 1.2:** The majority (over 50%) of students served statewide are from low-income schools.
 - **Objective 1.3:** The majority (over 50%) of students served statewide are in need of academic support.

¹ Due to missing data and/or some grantees voluntarily terminating and not offering services, findings from this report will be based on a total of 61 Cohort 11 grantees and 45 Cohort 12 grantees.

² During the May 2017 State Board Meeting it was recommended that the Allotment Policy Manual be revised to offer three-year 21st CCLC grants to approved organizations; thus, Cohort 12 was the first cohort to receive a three-year grant (as opposed to previous cohorts that had four-year grant funding cycles with reduced funding in the final year).

³ <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stcclc/performance.html>



- **Goal 2:** Enrolled students meet the definition of “regular” attendance.
 - **Objective 2.1:** Statewide percentage of students attending 30 days or more is at least 70% (80% in elementary, 60% in middle school, and 40% in high school).
 - **Objective 2.2:** Statewide percentage of centers with an average attendance of 30 days or more will not fall below 87%.
- **Goal 3:** Programs will offer services in core academic areas and in enrichment.
 - **Objective 3.1:** More than 85% of centers offer services in at least one core academic area.
 - **Objective 3.2:** More than 85% of centers offer enrichment support activities.
- **Goal 4:** “Regular” attendees will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.
 - **Objective 4.1:** The statewide percentage of “regular” attendees (Grades 4-8), with two years of state test data, who improve from “non-proficient” (levels i, ii or iii) to “proficient” (levels iv or v) will be at least 11%.
 - **Objective 4.2:** “Regular” attendees (Grades 4-8) with two years of state test data will demonstrate year-to-year change on state tests in reading and math at least as great or greater than the state population year-to-year change.
 - **Objective 4.3:** The majority (over 50%) of classroom teachers responding to a Teacher Survey will rate 21st CCLC “regular” attendees’ classroom performance and behavior as improved.

Goal 1 focuses on the extent to which grantees, statewide, enroll the students for whom the program is intended. **Goal 2** addresses the extent to which enrolled students, statewide, are “regularly” attending the after-school programming provided by the grantees. “Regular” attendees are defined by the federal program requirements as those students who attend 30 days or more during the course of the school year.

Goals 3 and 4 reflect the wording of the federal 21st CCLC program-established performance objectives and indicators required by states with 21st CCLC programs as part of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). Goal 3 relates to ensuring funded programs provide the required academic and enrichment activities to students. Goal 4 focuses on the outcomes desired for those students who participate on a “regular” basis (at least 30 days for the school year).

Under Goal 4, two sources of data on the progress of participating students were obtained and analyzed. The first source was state test score results for participating Grades 4-8 students who attended at least 30 days for the 2017-18 school year and who had two years of state test results on End-of-Grade (EOG) tests in reading or math. The second source of data were Teacher Surveys. The surveys are distributed by grantees to classroom teachers of “regular” attendees; for those students with returned surveys, the grantees then, in turn, enter teachers’ ratings into 21DC, the state database for this program. More information about the Teacher Survey is provided in the discussion of Objective 4.3.

Below, we provide data on the extent to which the state objectives for the 21st CCLC program were met for 2017-18 for the four goals.



Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled

As context for this goal, Table 1 describes the number of grantees and centers, statewide, for 2016-17 and 2017-18 and the average number of students served per grantee. Because the first year of operation for Cohort 12 was 2017-18, no data are reported for Cohort 12 in 2016-17. During the 2017-18 school year, there were a total of 106⁴ grantees operating 262 centers (average of 2 centers per grantee). Statewide, the 106 grantees reported 17,340 participating students, with an average of 165 students served per grantee.

Table 1. 21st CCLC 2016-17 and 2017-18 Grantees, Centers, and Participating Students

	Cohort 11 2016-17	Cohort 11** 2017-18	Cohort 12 2016-17	Cohort 12** 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2016-17	Both Cohorts 2017-18
Grantees						
Number of grantees	63	61	N/A	45	N/A	106
Number of participating students	9,952	8,709	N/A	8,693	N/A	17,340*
Average number of students served by grantees	158	143	N/A	194	N/A	165
Centers						
Number of centers	153	145	N/A	117	N/A	262
Number of centers per grantee (range)	1-8	1-8	N/A	1-8	N/A	1-8
Average number of centers per grantee	2	2	N/A	3	N/A	2

Note. Includes all students, regardless of days of attendance.

* 62 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 11 and Cohort 12 centers.

** Cohort 11, in its last (fourth) year of funding, received a 40% decrease, thus, a decrease in participating students and number of centers. In 2017-18, Cohort 12 was in its first year of funding.

As can be seen in the last column of Table 2, for 2017-18, of the 17,340 enrolled, 64% were elementary-level students (with 26% from middle schools and 10% from high schools). Approximately half of the students enrolled in 2017-18 were African American, 24% were White, and 19% were Hispanic (similar percentages for ethnicity as reported in 2016-17).

Table 2. 21st CCLC Participating Students in 2016-17 and 2017-18

	Cohort 11 2016-17	Cohort 11 2017-18	Cohort 12 2016-17	Cohort 12 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2016-17	Both Cohorts 2017-18
Number of centers	153	145	N/A	117	N/A	262
Average # of students served per center	68	62	N/A	75	N/A	68
Number of participating students	9,952	8,709	N/A	8,693	N/A	17,340*
By School Level						
% Elementary School	70%	72%	N/A	57%	N/A	64%
% Middle School	23%	22%	N/A	29%	N/A	26%
% High School	6%	6%	N/A	14%	N/A	10%

⁴ Thirteen grantees operated 18 centers that were reported as being funded by both Cohorts 11 and 12. In the event that a grantee operated both Cohort 11 and 12 centers, data for these grantees were analyzed and reported separately by cohort.



	Cohort 11 2016-17	Cohort 11 2017-18	Cohort 12 2016-17	Cohort 12 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2016-17	Both Cohorts 2017-18
By Ethnicity						
% African American	56%	54%	N/A	45%	N/A	49%
% White	20%	20%	N/A	27%	N/A	24%
% Hispanic	20%	22%	N/A	16%	N/A	19%
% Other	4%	5%	N/A	12%	N/A	9%

* 62 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 11 and Cohort 12 centers.

Objective 1.1: The Majority (Over 50%) of Grantees Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students

Applicants seeking a 21st CCLC grant were required to estimate the number of students their program would enroll. Thus, grantee performance can be reviewed by examining the percent of grantees who reported enrolling their projected number of participants. The number of students enrolled per grantee was calculated using student-level 21st CCLC grantee-reported data provided by NCDPI. The reported number of students Cohort 11 and 12 grantees proposed to serve ranged from 50 to 520, while the reported number of students enrolled in 21st CCLC programs in 2017-18 ranged from 41 to 634.

To describe the extent of enrollment by grantee, the enrollment projections of grantees were classified as “met” if the number of students who were enrolled was at least 75% of their projected enrollment.

✓ Objective 1.1—Met
For 2017-18, this objective was met. Approximately 93% of Cohort 11 grantees and 93% of Cohort 12 grantees reported serving at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2017-18, with a total across both cohorts of 93%. The objective was exceeded in that almost all (93%) grantees enrolled at least 75% of their projected number of students.

In exploring variations across types of organizations, Table 3 shows that, across organization types, the percentage of grantees with at least 75% of projected enrollment was lowest (79%) for Faith-Based Organizations.

Table 3. Number of Grantees that Enrolled At Least 75% of Projected Students by Organization Type

Organization Type	Both Cohorts 2017-18	
	# of Grantees	#% of grantees that enrolled \geq 75% of projected students
Charter School (CS)	3	3 (100%)
Community-Based Organization (CBO)	48	45 (94%)
Faith-Based Organization (FBO)	14	11 (79%)
School District (SD)	35	34 (97%)
Other	6	6 (100%)
TOTAL	106	99 (93%)



Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools

One focus of the federal 21st CCLC funding is on supporting students from high-poverty schools. Table 4 indicates that 82% of students who attended Cohort 11 and Cohort 12 centers in 2017-18 attended schools that qualified for Title I funding. Elementary school participants in 21st CCLC programs were overwhelmingly from Title I schools (97%), while 66% of middle school participants, and 34% of high school participants were from Title I schools.

Table 4. 21st CCLC Participating Students from Title I Schools in 2017-18

	Cohort 11	Cohort 12	Both Cohorts
Average # of students from Title I schools served per center	52	61	56
Average % of students from Title I schools served per center	83%	82%	82%
Number of participating Title I students	7,592	7,174	14,766
By School Level			
% Elementary School	95%	99%	97%
% Middle School	68%	65%	66%
% High School	14%	42%	34%
By Ethnicity			
% African American	86%	89%	87%
% White	77%	69%	72%
% Hispanic	89%	82%	86%
% Other	81%	82%	82%

✓ Objective 1.2—Met
This objective was met for 2017-18 in that, overall, an average of 82% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (56 students on average per center coming from Title I schools).

Objective 1.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are in Need of Academic Support

Given the focus of the 21st CCLC program on students from low-performing schools, it is germane to examine the extent to which students (Grades 4-8) entering the 21st CCLC program for any given year scored “non-proficient” on the previous year’s state tests in reading or math. That is, are over 50% of the students served entering the program at the beginning of the year in academic need, as judged by their performance on the prior year’s state tests?

State EOG test results are reported using the following five proficiency levels⁵:

- Level I: Students have limited command of knowledge and skills
- Level II: Students have partial command of the knowledge and skills
- Level III: Students have sufficient command of the knowledge and skills
- Level IV: Students have solid command of the knowledge and skills
- Level V: Students have superior command of the knowledge and skills

⁵ For the purposes of this report, “non-proficient” is defined as those students who fall within proficiency Level I, Level II, and Level III.



This scale, adopted by the North Carolina State Board of Education in 2013, is meant to convey the degree to which a student is prepared to proceed to the next grade level. Table 5 shows that, for Cohort 11, based on the total number of students in Grades 4 to 8 (with prior year test scores who were served in 2016-17), 75% entered the school year “non-proficient” in reading and 70% entered “non-proficient” in math. For students served in 2017-18, 74% of Cohort 11 and Cohort 12 students in Grades 4 to 8 were “non-proficient” in reading at the beginning of the school year, while 67% of Cohort 11 and 69% of Cohort 12 students were “non-proficient” in math.

Table 5. Percent of 21st CCLC Students (Grades 4-8) “Non-Proficient” in Reading or Math EOG Tests in 2016 for 2016-17 School Year and in 2017 for 2017-18 School Year

	Reading		Math	
	Cohort 11	Cohort 12	Cohort 11	Cohort 12
% “non-proficient” at end of 2016 (prior to being served in 2016-17 school year)	75%	N/A	70%	N/A
% “non-proficient” at end of 2017 (prior to being served in 2017-18 school year)	74%	74%	67%	69%

Note. N sizes varied by cohort and subject.

✓ Objective 1.3—Met
This objective was met in 2017-18 because, for participating students in Grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, the majority (over 50%), in this case 67%, were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.

Goal 2: Enrolled Students Meet the Definition of “Regular” Attendance

Program attendance is a critical aspect in determining program success. That is, if participating students do not participate “regularly,” they will be less likely to realize any significant benefits, academic or otherwise. “Regular” attendance is defined by federal guidelines as attending the program for a minimum of 30 days. “Regular” attendance is measured here in the following two ways:

- Objective 2.1: the percentage of students who participated “regularly” overall, as well as the percentages by school level (elementary, middle, high)
- Objective 2.2: the percentage of centers, statewide, with an average attendance of 30 days or more (“regular” attendance).

For both objectives, the target percentages were set based on statewide baseline data reported on students participating in 2014-15.

Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More is At Least 70% (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School)

As Table 6 shows, statewide, 69% (for Cohort 11 and Cohort 12 combined) of enrolled students attended for 30 days or more in 2017-18, while 31% of students attended fewer than 30 days. The percentage of students who were “regular” attendees was highest at the elementary level



(80%) and decreased in middle school (56%) and high school (31%), when other after-school activities may be more likely to interfere with program attendance.

Table 6. Cohort 11 and 12 Center Attendance in 2016-17 and 2017-18

	Cohort 11 2016-17	Cohort 11 2017-18	Cohort 12 2016-17	Cohort 12 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2016-17	Both Cohorts 2017-18
Students						
% of “regular” attendees (30 days or more)	75%	75%	N/A	63%	N/A	69%
% 30-89 days	42%	42%	N/A	37%	N/A	40%
% 90 days or more	33%	33%	N/A	26%	N/A	29%
% of “non-regular” attendees	25%	25%	N/A	37%	N/A	31%
School-Level						
% of ES “regular” attendees	81%	82%	N/A	77%	N/A	80%
% of MS “regular” attendees	60%	58%	N/A	55%	N/A	56%
% of HS “regular” attendees	56%	54%	N/A	20%	N/A	31%

Note. “Regular” attendees = ≥ 30 days; “Non-regular” attendees < 30 days

<p>✓ Objective 2.1—Partially Met (Overall Not Met; Elem Met; Middle School Not Met; High School Not Met)</p> <p>Overall, this objective was not met in 2017-18 in that 69% of participants attended 30 days or more (were “regular” attendees). However, the objective was met for elementary students as the percentage of students attending 30 days or more was 80% among elementary students. The objective was not met at the secondary level with only 56% of middle school students, and 31% of high school students attending 30 days or more.</p>
--

Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More Will Not Fall Below 87%

Another way of examining attendance data is based on the percentage of centers, statewide, with average attendance that is high versus low (according to the federal standard, low attendance is defined as fewer than 30 days). In 2017-18, 86% of 21st CCLC centers statewide had average attendance at or above the federally-defined 30-day minimum for a “regular” attendee, and 14% had average attendance below the 30-day minimum. The objective results are described by Cohort. It should be noted that Cohort 12 was in its first year of operation in 2017-18 and thus, may see an improvement in “regular” attendance in future years.

Table 7. Cohort 11 and 12 Percentage of Centers with Average Attendance Meeting and Not Meeting “Regular” Attendee Definition

	Cohort 11 2016-17	Cohort 11 2017-18	Cohort 12 2016-17	Cohort 12 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2016-17	Both Cohorts 2017-18
% of centers statewide with average attendance of 30 days or more	87%	88%	N/A	84%	N/A	86%
% of centers statewide with average attendance fewer than 30 days	13%	12%	N/A	16%	N/A	14%



✓ **Objective 2.2—Partially Met** (Cohort 11 Met; Cohort 12 Not Met)

Cohort 11 **met** this objective in 2017-18, as 88% of centers reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 12% of centers reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average. For Cohort 12 this objective was **not met** in 2017-18, as 84% of centers reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 16% of centers reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.

Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment

In order to meet the federal requirements for this program, grantees are expected to offer services that emphasize core academic areas, such as reading or STEM. In addition, grantees are expected to offer services that emphasize enrichment areas (e.g., character education, youth leadership or drug and violence prevention), which complement academic program services.

Objective 3.1: More than 85% of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area

In their reporting to NCDPI, grantees indicated how often they emphasized specific academic areas in terms of High to Low Frequency. Table 8 shows that, across all centers operating in 2017-18 (145 in Cohort 11 and 117 in Cohort 12), over 85% reported a “high frequency” of academic activities in the area of Literacy and more generally, in Homework Help and Tutoring. Also, at least 85% reported a “high frequency” of activities in support of English Language Learners.

Table 8. Cohort 11 and 12 Center-Reported Frequency of Core Academic Activities

Academic Activities	Cohort 11 (145 Centers)		Cohort 12 (117 Centers)	
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month – Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month – Once per Term) to None
English Language Learners Support	89%	11%	85%	15%
Homework Help	100%	0%	100%	0%
Literacy	97%	3%	100%	0%
STEM	85%	15%	80%	20%
Tutoring	100%	0%	99%	1%

✓ **Objective 3.1—Met**

This objective was met in 2017-18, as over 85% of Cohort 11 and Cohort 12 centers reported that they frequently provided activities in Literacy, Homework Help, and Tutoring.

Objective 3.2: More than 85% of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities

Grantees also reported to NCDPI on the frequency that specific enrichment areas were offered for the past year. For example, as shown in Table 9, over 90% of all centers from both cohorts



reported emphasizing physical activity at least once a week. Youth Leadership and Arts and Music activities were reported as occurring with high frequency by over 60% of both cohorts.

Roughly 48% of Cohort 11 centers and 66% of Cohort 12 centers reported a high frequency of at least one character education activity. In 2017-18, on average, Cohort 11 and 12 grantees reported a high frequency of three character education activities. On average, Cohort 11 and Cohort 12 grantees reported a high frequency of four enrichment activities. Approximately 86% of Cohort 11 centers and 96% of Cohort 12 centers indicated a high frequency of at least one enrichment activity.

Table 9. Cohort 11 and 12 Center-Reported Frequency of Specific Enrichment Activities

Type of Activity	Cohort 11 (145 Centers)		Cohort 12 (117 Centers)	
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month-Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month-Once per Term) to None
Character Education				
Counseling Programs	58%	42%	50%	50%
Drug Prevention	7%	93%	33%	67%
Truancy Prevention	38%	62%	67%	33%
Violence Prevention	57%	43%	53%	47%
Youth Leadership	57%	43%	59%	41%
Enrichment				
Arts & Music	75%	25%	84%	15%
Community / Service Learning	14%	86%	10%	90%
Entrepreneurship	56%	44%	38%	62%
Mentoring	81%	19%	79%	21%
Physical Activity	96%	4%	96%	4%

✓ Objective 3.2—Met
This objective was met by both cohorts in that 100% of Cohort 11 and 12 centers reported a high frequency of at least one character education <i>or</i> enrichment activity.

Goal 4: “Regular” Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes

The federal guidance includes the expectation that “regular” attendees in 21st CCLC programs should demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes. That is, the expectation of the grant program is that participating students will benefit academically, and in other ways, by participating in this program. Data used to address Goal 4 included (a) state achievement test results in reading and math at Grades 4-8 and (b) classroom Teacher Surveys of individual participating students’ improvement in classroom performance and behavior as collected by grantees at the end of the year.



A. State Achievement Test Results in Reading and Math

Regarding state achievement test data, two indicators of educational benefits of the program are presented below, both based on state achievement test results in reading and math in Grades 4-8, but examined using different methods:

- Indicator 1: *Change in “Regular” Attendees’ Status from “Non-Proficient” to “Proficient.”* We examined the percentage of “regular” attendees (30 days or more) whose achievement test scores improved from “below proficient” to “proficient” or above on reading or math state assessments.
- Indicator 2: *Average Year-to-Year Change in Participants’ Test Scores:* We examined standardized year-to-year change scores for “regular” attendees in Grades 4-8 as compared to the state population year-to-year change.

The results of these two different approaches to examining participants’ reading and math EOG test score changes from the end of the 2016-17 school year to the end of 2017-18 school year are described below.

Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8), With Two Years of State Test Data, Who Improve from “Non-Proficient” (Levels I, II or III) to “Proficient” (Levels IV or V) Will Be At Least 11%⁶

As defined by the North Carolina College and Career Readiness (CCR) Standards, if a reading EOG score is categorized as Level IV proficiency or above, then the student is considered “proficient.” To examine participating students’ changes in proficiency status, we requested from NCDPI, two years of state test results in reading and math for all students enrolled in 21st CCLC programs in 2017-18.

As shown in Tables 10 and 11, we first calculated the number of students whose scores indicated they were “non-proficient” at the end of the 2016-17 academic year (“Level I, II or III in 2017”) categorized by level of attendance (< 30 days “non-regular” attendees / ≥ 30 days “regular” attendees). Next, we show the number of these “non-proficient” students in 2017 who scored “Level IV or V in 2018.” Then we calculated the percent of those students who scored “non-proficient” in 2017 who subsequently scored “proficient” at the end of 2018. (Of the 12,040 students reported as “regularly” attending, there were 5,986 in Grades 4-8 who had two years of state test scores in reading and 5,942 in math.)

Table 10 shows that, on the **reading EOG** assessment, for all students statewide (not just those attending 21st CCLC programs), 16% of students who were “non-proficient” at the end of academic year 2016-17 moved to “proficient” status at the end of academic year 2017-18. For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 11 and 12, the comparable percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in reading was 10% and for those students who did not attend “regularly,” the percentage was 11%.

⁶ Note: The 11% threshold for Objective 4.1 was based on the 2014-15 baseline.



Table 11 shows that, on the **math EOG** assessment, for all students statewide (not just those attending 21st CCLC programs), 13% of students who were “non-proficient” in 2017 moved to “proficient” status in 2018. For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 11 and 12, the comparable percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in math was 12% and for “non-regular” attendees, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” was 9%.

Table 10. Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2018—**READING EOG**

Grade in 2017	Grade in 2018	All Students (Statewide)			21 st CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 st CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2017	Level IV or V in 2018	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2017	Level IV or V in 2018	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2017	Level IV or V in 2018	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	61,665	9,885	16%	347	32	9%	1,375	143	10%
04	05	64,936	9,059	14%	376	33	9%	1,381	125	9%
05	06	64,302	15,144	24%	451	75	17%	817	106	13%
06	07	53,815	9,251	17%	437	59	14%	548	64	12%
07	08	51,826	5,516	11%	349	24	7%	420	29	7%
All Grades 4-8		296,544	48,855	16%	1,960	223	11%	4,541	467	10%

Table 11. Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2018—**MATH EOG**

Grade in 2017	Grade in 2018	All Students (Statewide)			21 st CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 st CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2017	Level IV or V in 2018	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2017	Level IV or V in 2018	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2017	Level IV or V in 2018	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	54,485	8,799	16%	304	33	11%	1,175	130	11%
04	05	56,375	10,625	19%	349	42	12%	1,209	209	17%
05	06	51,280	4,991	10%	387	24	6%	678	47	7%
06	07	59,160	7,089	12%	448	41	9%	571	61	11%
07	08	57,765	5,808	10%	373	28	8%	467	37	8%
All Grades 4-8		279,065	37,312	13%	1,861	168	9%	4,100	484	12%

✓ **Objective 4.1—Partially Met** (Math Met; Reading Not Met)
 The objective of having at least 11% of “regular” attendees (in Grades 4-8 with two years of state test results) improving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” was **met** in 2017-18 for math but **not met** for reading. For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 11 and 12, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” was 10% for reading and 12% for math.

Objective 4.2: “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8) With Two Years of State Test Data Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change On State Tests in Reading and Math At Least as Great or Greater Than the State Population Year-to-Year Change

The following table describes a second way of describing the state test score changes experienced by Grade 4-8 participants from 2017 to 2018. These analyses describe the year-to-



year change in test scores for the students served in the 21st CCLC program relative to the year-to-year change in the overall state population. That is, the average change in standardized scores⁷ was calculated for “regular” attendees, and that average change was compared to the average 2017 to 2018 change for all students in the state at the respective grade levels. To meet this objective, “regular” attendees were expected to show average improvement in state test scores at the same rate as the state average year-to-year change, or greater. The results of the change score analyses, the difference in students’ standardized scores from one year to the next (2017 to 2018), are presented below.

Table 12 describes the year-to-year change on state EOG reading and math tests for Cohorts 11 and 12 students in Grades 4-8.

- Where the average change in “regular” attendees’ scores were significantly greater than the statewide average change scores the change has been labeled “**Above.**”
- Similarly, where “regular” attendees did not show an average change in scores as great as students across the state, the change has been labeled “**Below.**”
- Finally, where there was no measurable difference between the “regular” attendees and the statewide student population as a whole, the change was labeled “**Same.**”

Table 12. Year-to-Year Change in Reading and Math EOG Scores for “Regular” Attendees in Cohorts 11 and 12 Compared to State Average by Grade

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Grade 4	Same	Below (-0.04)
Grade 5	Same	Above (+0.08)
Grade 6	Same	Same
Grade 7	Same	Same
Grade 8	Above (+0.06)	Above (+0.45)
TOTAL	Same	Above (+0.05)

✓ **Objective 4.2—Met**

This objective was **met** in Reading. On the Reading EOG, the 21st CCLC “regular” attendees across grade levels (Total row) improved their scores from year-to-year at the same rate as students across the state. Disaggregated along grade levels, eighth grade students improved their scores in reading at a slightly greater rate than students statewide.

This objective was also **met** in Math. On the Math EOG, the 21st CCLC “regular” attendees across grade levels (Total row) improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate slightly greater than students across the state. Disaggregated along grade levels, fifth and eighth grade students improved their scores in math at a rate greater than students statewide. However, fourth grade students showed less improvement in their scores in math relative to the rate of change of students statewide.

⁷ Different EOG assessments were used across grades, and the resulting EOG scores are not on a comparable scale. In order to make valid comparisons among scores from one year to the next, the assessments must be placed on a common, standardized scale. Standardization is achieved through a two-step process. First, scores for a given test are centered about the state mean for the grade in question by subtracting the state mean from each score on the EOG. Second, the centered scores are divided by the state standard deviation for the test in question. This results in a standardized score that is interpreted as the number of standard deviations that the original score lies from the state mean for that assessment. A standardized score of 1.5 indicates that the student’s score was 1.5 standard deviations above the state mean for that assessment, while a standardized score of 0 indicates that the student’s score was equivalent to the state mean. Change relative to the state mean was measured using a paired-sample *t*-test with a threshold of $p \leq 0.05$.



B. Classroom Teacher Survey on “Regular” Attendees’ Improvement at End of Year

In addition to state test results, another possible indicator of participation impact on students is classroom Teacher Surveys of improvements in “regular” attendees’ classroom performance and behavior over the course of the school year. NCDPI makes available a Teacher Survey for grantees to use on their website⁸. Grantees are instructed to distribute the Teacher Survey to a classroom teacher of each participating “regular” attendee (30 days or more)⁹. It is the responsibility of the grantee to enter completed Teacher Survey responses for individual students into the 21DC system¹⁰ as well as indicate whether or not the Teacher Survey is returned¹¹. For each Teacher Survey that is completed and returned on a “regular attendee,” grantees must indicate in 21DC whether the student had a “reported improvement in homework completion and classroom participation” (response options being Yes or No) and/or a “reported improvement in student behavior” (response options being Yes or No).

Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding to a Teacher Survey Will Rate 21st CCLC “Regular” Attendees’ Classroom Performance and Behavior as Improved

Table 13 presents the response rates, by grade level, for the 21st CCLC Teacher Survey as reported by grantees who distributed these surveys. These response rates reflect completed surveys for students who were “regular” attendees in the 21st CCLC after-school programs in 2017-18. Grantees reported, via their data entry into 21DC, that 9,498 Teacher Surveys were distributed and that 8,035 were returned for a response rate of 85%. However, the number of “regular” attendees was 12,040, and the number of students with completed surveys was 8,035 so the percent of “regular” attendees without survey information was 33%.

Table 13. Teacher Survey Response Rates in 2017-18 by Grade (for “Regular” Attendees)

Grade Level	Both Cohorts		
	Teacher Surveys Distributed	Teacher Surveys Returned	Response Rate
Elementary	7,047	5,980	85%
Middle	2,099	1,823	87%
High	352	232	66%
TOTAL	9,498	8,035	85%

Around 68% of the Cohort 11 and 12 grantees achieved a response rate from teachers in 2017-18 of 70% to 100%. By contrast, in 2016-17, 74% of the Cohort 10 and 11 grantees achieved response rates in this range.

⁸ <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/21cclc/reporting/>

⁹ If elementary students, the survey goes to their regular teacher. If middle or high school, the survey goes to only one teacher in the areas in which the student is receiving academic assistance. The choice of teacher is determined by the grantee request to the school and school compliance with the request. Thus, no student will have more than one survey reported.

¹⁰ Grantees enter Teacher Survey distribution data at the individual student level in 21DC (Prompt: Teacher Survey distributed; Response options: Yes or No).

¹¹ Grantees enter returned Teacher Survey status in 21DC at the individual student level (Prompt: Teacher Survey returned; Response options: Yes or No).



Table 14 shows the results of the Teacher Surveys as entered into 21DC by grantees. Grantees were only asked to indicate in the 21DC database whether the Teacher Survey for the “regular” attendee indicated “improvement” or not¹².

Table 14. Teacher Survey Ratings of Student Improvement (“Regular” Attendees)

Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2017-18		
	Responses	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Homework Completion and Class Participation	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Student Behavior
Elementary	5,980	84%	68%
Middle	1,823	86%	74%
High	232	88%	84%
TOTAL	8,035	85%	70%

✓ Objective 4.3—Met
This objective was met in 2017-18, as over 50% of “regular” attendees across Cohorts 11 and 12 with returned Teacher Surveys were reported by grantees to have improved in the following two areas: (1) homework completion and class participation and (2) student behavior.

Summary

As the summary table below shows, statewide grantee performance in 2017-18 “met” seven of ten state objectives, as indicated by the status column. Three of the ten objectives were “partially met”; 2.1 and 2.2 on attendance in the after school program, and 4.1 on grades 4-8 “regular” attendees’ movement from non-proficient to proficient status on state tests in reading and math.

Table 15. Summary of 2017-18 21st CCLC Progress Monitoring Findings

Goals/Objectives	2017-18 Status	Summary of Findings
Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled		
Objective 1.1: The Majority (Over 50%) of Grantees Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students	Met	Approximately 93% of Cohort 11 grantees and 93% of Cohort 12 grantees served at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2017-18, with a total across both cohorts of 93% (which represents the majority, greater than 50%).

¹² In order to align Teacher Survey data with the 21DC response options, it is understood that grantees had to interpret and categorize teacher responses. For example, if a student was reported to have “moderate improvement” in completing homework and a “slight decline” in class participation, it would be at the discretion of the grantee to determine if the student would receive a “Yes” indicating improvement or not.



Goals/Objectives	2017-18 Status	Summary of Findings
Goal 1 (cont'd): Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled		
Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools	Met	An average of 82% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (56 students on average per center coming from Title I schools).
Objective 1.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are in Need of Academic Support	Met	For participating students in Grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, 67% were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.
Goal 2: Enrolled Students Meet Definition of "Regular" Attendance		
Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More is At Least 70% (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School)	Partially Met (Met for elementary but not middle or high school students)	Overall 69% of participants attended 30 days or more (i.e., were "regular" attendees). The percentage of students attending 30 days or more was 80% among elementary students, 56% among middle school students, and 31% among high school students.
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More Will Not Fall Below 87%	Partially Met (Met in Cohort 11 but not Cohort 12)	Cohort 11 met this objective in 2017-18, as 88% of centers reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 12% of centers reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average. Cohort 12 did not meet this objective in 2017-18, as 84% of centers reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 16% of centers reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.
Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment		
Objective 3.1: More than 85% of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area	Met	Over 85% of Cohort 11 and Cohort 12 centers reported that they frequently provided activities in Literacy, Homework Help, and Tutoring.
Objective 3.2: More than 85% of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	Met	This objective was met by both cohorts in that 100% of Cohort 11 and 12 centers reported a high frequency of at least one character education or enrichment activity.
Goal 4: "Regular" Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes		
Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of "Regular" Attendees (Grades 4-8), With Two Years of State Test Data, Who Improve from "Non-Proficient" (Levels I, II or III) to "Proficient" (Levels IV or V) Will Be At Least 11%. (<i>Indicator 1</i>)	Partially Met (Met in Math but not Reading)	Reading EOG: For "regular" attendees, 10% moved from "non-proficient" in 2017 to "proficient" in 2018. Math EOG: For "regular" attendees, 12% moved from "non-proficient" in 2017 to "proficient" in 2018.



Goal 4 (cont'd): "Regular" Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes		
Objective 4.2: "Regular" Attendees (Grades 4-8) With Two Years of State Test Data Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change On State Tests in Reading and Math at Least As Great Or Greater Than The State Population Year-to-Year Change. (<i>Indicator 2</i>)	Met	<p>On the Reading EOG, "regular" attendees across Grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at the same rate as students across the state.</p> <p>On the Math EOG, the "regular" attendees across Grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate slightly greater than students across the state.</p>
Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding to a Teacher Survey Will Rate 21 st CCLC "Regular" Attendees' Classroom Performance and Behavior as Improved	Met	Over 50% of "regular" attendees across Cohorts 11 and 12 with returned Teacher Surveys were reported to have made improvement in the following two areas: homework completion and class participation, and student behavior.

